

In response to applicant's arguments the examiner reminds the applicant that the structure of the claims is met by the prior art and that the functionality of a bed and a trampoline ~~in this instance~~ is identical in certain instances. It is known in the art that children jump up and down on a bed in the same manner as a child would jump up and down on a trampoline. The bed in this case would serve as a bouncing device / trampoline for the child. The examiner further notes that the structure of the bed is very similar to the structure of the trampoline. Given the above teaching of the functionality of the bed and trampoline and the structural equivalence of the two devices, the examiner considers the device as claimed as fully disclosed in the art of beds.

As to the applicants claims of independent poles and a protective covering the examiner considers the combined disclosures of Vail Osborne and Koenig to disclose the the device as claimed in the art of beds. The prior art discloses a device having independent poles connected at their upper ends by a frame and it also discloses the feature in beds of a covering as claimed.

7,40 1) Jerome Donnelly
2) 5712724975